



Attorney Docket No.: GTW-0152/P1415.2

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| Applicant(s): Robert A. BOGER | Conf. No.: 2426 |
| Application No.: 10/786,264 | Art Unit: 2628 |
| Filed: February 25, 2004 | Examiner: Jeffrey J. CHOW |
| Title: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR CHANGING THE MODE OF A DISPLAY APPARATUS | |

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

The applicant thanks Examiner Chow and Examiner Brier for the courtesies extended to applicant's representative during the In-person Interview of May 22, 2007 and during the ensuing Telephone Interview of May 24, 2007.

During the In-person Interview of May 22, 2007 the Examiners and Applicant's Representative discussed the gist of the invention, in general, the patent documents being applied in the pending rejections, and then focused on the embodiment being claimed in the present application. Aspects of this embodiment are disclosed throughout the disclosure, for example, at the paragraph spanning pages 13-14 and shown in FIG. 6.

It was agreed that the proposed claim amendments (now filed in the Amendment of May 25, 2007) more clearly claim the embodiments pertaining to the overlay window. For example, the amendment to claim 1 includes the following language:

video capture circuitry configured for use in the noninterlaced mode to convert the television compatible signal into a noninterlaced television output to be displayed in an overlay window while said visually detectable output from the host computer system is being displayed.

In the final Office Action of January 29, 2007, the claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of various hypothetical combinations, some of which include U.S. Patent 5,287,189 (Ersoz). During the In-person Interview of May 22, 2007 there was some disagreement as to what the Ersoz patent teaches regarding an interlaced signal being converted to a noninterlaced signal. Therefore, it was agreed that the Examiners and Applicant's Representative would consider this patent for a couple more days and reconvene the conversation in a Telephone Interview on May 24, 2007.

The Ersoz Patent

During the Telephone Interview of May 24, 2007 the Examiners pointed to the passage in the Ersoz patent that states "[t]he auxiliary channel is thereby converted to noninterlaced video."¹ Applicant's Representative pointed out that, although the Ersoz patent uses the word "converted," the process described in Ersoz does not convert an interlaced signal into a noninterlaced signal in a manner that the present claims read on. The Ersoz system discards half of the interlaced TV signal rather than converting it. This is described in Ersoz at column 2.

¹ Ersoz, col. 19, lines 52-53.

Therefore, the features of amended claim 1 do not read upon the Ersoz system since, in the claims, *the* television compatible signal is converted into a noninterlaced television output—rather than merely discarding half of the signal as is apparently done in the Ersoz system.

Applicant's Representative submitted that the Ersoz patent does not teach or suggest the aforementioned “converting” feature of the claims for at least these reasons. Therefore, withdrawal of the pending rejections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. However, in the event there are any unresolved issues, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact applicant's representative, Scott Richardson, by telephone at (571) 748-4765 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,



Scott Charles Richardson
Reg. No. 43,436

McGrath, Geissler, Olds & Richardson, PLLC
P.O. Box 7085
Alexandria, VA 22307

Date: May 25, 2007